

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/022,482

Applicant(s)

SHACKNAI ET AL.

Examiner

JYOTHSNA A VENKAT

Art Unit

1615

All Participants:**Status of Application:** _____(1) JYOTHSNA A VENKAT.

(3) _____

(2) Maryellen Feehery.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 March 2004**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, written description, scope of enablement, enablement, 102 and 103

Claims discussed:

as of record

Prior art documents discussed:

as of record

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


JYOTHSNA VENKAT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1500 1600

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed the attorney that the amendment after final adding the expression "substantially free of attapugite" is new matter to which the attorney informed the examiner that the examples in the specification do not have this component. The examiner informed the attorney that the expression is new matter. The examiner also informed the attorney that after reviewing the declaration by Marks, the declaration supports the examiners position that only certain concentration of sulfur is suitable and the claims which do not recite the concentration of sulfur disclosed in the specification does not meet the enablement rejection and the claims also do not meet the written description for various sulfur derivatives. The examiner informed the attorney that based upon the declaration by the inventor which shows unexpected results, the claims are in condition for allowance subjecting to incorporating claim 61 into all the independent method of use claims since the declaration under exhibit A tested the composition drawn to claim 61 and incorporating the ranges for sulfur and sulfacetamide. The attorney agreed. The examiner requested the attorney to fax the amendment to right fax so that the fax will be forwarded to central fax. The attorney agreed..